

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been revised to define the invention with additional clarity. The revision moots the rejection under 35 USC 101. New claim 46 has been added. The new claim is fully supported by the disclosure (see, for example, page 4, lines 7 and 8, and claim 4 as originally filed).

Claims 8, 11-23, and 25-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking written description. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order for the reasons that follow.

Applicants respectfully submit that the articles by Nakamura et al and Bryan et al make it clear that one skilled in the art would have readily appreciated what was intended by the phrase "the catalytic subunit of a mammalian telomerase reverse transcriptase". Further, these articles demonstrate that telomerase reverse transcriptases are highly conserved among eukaryotes (attention is again directed to Fig. 2 of Nakamura et al and Fig. 1 of Bryan et al). Thus, in the case of the catalytic subunit of telomerase reverse transcriptase component of the claimed chimera, there is no substantial variation within the genus. The description at, for example, page 4 of the application, first full paragraph, is more than adequate.

As regards the telomere binding polypeptide component of the claimed chimeric molecule, attention is again directed to the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the application where specific reference is made to 9 different moieties, with 10 references being cited (which are incorporated by reference on page 15). Nothing more should be required.

-----  
Appl. No. 10/554,295

April 12, 2011

The disclosure conveys with far more than just reasonable clarity that Applicants were in full possession of the claimed invention as of the filing date. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 8, 11-23 and 25-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being non-enabled. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order for the reasons that follow.

The foregoing comments make it clear that the subject specification is replete with examples of telomere binding polypeptides suitable for use in the claimed chimeric molecule and the examples of polypeptides having telomerase catalytic activity are more than adequate, particularly, given the conserved nature of such polypeptides.

The Examiner is again requested to explain why, based on the extensive disclosure provided, one skilled in the art could not practice the invention as claimed without undue experimentation so that Applicants can properly respond. Any experimentation that might be required to practice the invention would not be undue and would not require ingenuity beyond that possessed by one skilled in the art. The Examiner is requested to provide evidence to the contrary or withdraw the rejection.

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

Appl. No. 10/554,295  
April 12, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Mary J. Wilson

Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100